



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,313	12/19/2001	David J.P. Baar	3121183.0019	9388

20988 7590 11/16/2004

OGILVY RENAULT  
1981 MCGILL COLLEGE AVENUE  
SUITE 1600  
MONTREAL, QC H3A2Y3  
CANADA

EXAMINER

HARRISON, CHANTE E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2672

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/021,313

Applicant(s)

BAAR ET AL.

Examiner

Chante Harrison

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 6/21/04.

**This action is made FINAL.**

2. Claims 1-8, 10-31 are pending in the case. Claim 1 is an independent claim. Claims 1-8 and 10-31 have been amended. Claim 9 has been canceled.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1-17, 19-21, 23-24 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Robertson, et al, U.S. Patent 5,670,984, 9/1997.

As per independent claim 1, Robertson discloses a method for displaying a region of interest while transitioning between first and second locations for the region of interest within visual information on a display screen of a computer, comprising: applying a transformation to the visual information (Figs. 4 & 8) to improve visual detail in a border region of the region of interest by creating a

lens surface for the border region having a predetermined lens surface shape (i.e. the lens is shaped/sized according to user specification) (Fig. 4; col. 8, ll. 15-21; col. 11, ll. 14-16); and creating a presentation by overlaying the visual information on the lens surface (Fig. 9 "510 & 520") and projecting the lens surface with the visual information onto a plane (Fig. 9 "500") in a viewer-aligned direction (col. 5, ll. 40-47), and displaying the presentation on the display screen (Fig. 2).

As per dependent claim 2, Robertson discloses the transformation transforms only a portion of the visual information in the region of interest (col. 3, ll. 45-47; Fig. 4).

As per dependent claim 3, Robertson discloses the portion is a border of the region of interest (i.e. thick border region surrounding the region of interest) (Fig. 8).

As per dependent claims 4, Robertson discloses the border region is a periphery of said transitional region of interest (i.e. columns adjacent the region of interest are peripheral to the region) (Fig. 8).

As per dependent claim 5, Robertson discloses the lens surface for the border region is defined by a distortion function (i.e. the surface of the border region is transformed/distorted in varying degrees of detail) (col. 8, ll. 17-21).

As per dependent claim 6, Robertson discloses the lens surface for the border region is defined by a predetermined portion of a lens surface for rendering the region of interest (i.e. the lens shape, e.g. length and/or width, is determined by the region of interest and the lens position relative to the distance of other image planes) (col. 6, ll. 35-50; col. 7, ll. 31-41).

As per dependent claim 7, Robertson discloses the predetermined portion is a border region of the lens surface for rendering the region of interest (i.e. side panels are adjacent the center region of interest and are used to render the image using the desired focus of the user) (Fig. 9; col. 8, ll. 22-25).

As per dependent claim 8, Robertson discloses the predetermined portion is a periphery of the lens surface for rendering the region of interest (i.e. columns adjacent the region of interest are peripheral to the region) (Fig. 8; col. 8, ll. 22-25).

As per dependent claim 10, Robertson discloses establishing a path between the first and second locations for the region of interest (i.e. the movement of the lens over the image) (col. 6, ll. 40-45).

As per dependent claim 11, Robertson discloses the path is established automatically by a predetermined program (i.e. the viewplane which is used to

Art Unit: 2672

project the lens is controlled by the user or automatically by the stored program to alter the position of the plane) (col. 6, ll. 44-59).

As per dependent claim 12, Robertson discloses the path is established by user selection (i.e. the viewplane which is used to project the lens is controlled by the user or automatically by the stored program to alter the position of the plane) (col. 6, ll. 44-59).

As per dependent claim 13, Robertson increasing resolution of the visual information in the region of interest (Fig. 8); and decreasing resolution of the visual information outside the region of interest (i.e. image portions adjacent the region of interest are displayed in varied degrees of detail) (col. 8, ll. 15-21).

As per dependent claim 14, Robertson discloses the transformation provides a smooth transition to the region of interest from an adjacent region (col. 6, ll. 40-45; col. 7, ll. 43-45), by blending increased and said decreased resolution visual information in predefined regions adjacent to the region of interest (col. 8, ll. 15-21).

As per dependent claim 15, Robertson discloses the blending is performed by averaging the increased and said decreased resolution visual information (i.e. displaying the adjacent regions next to the region of interest by

varying the level of detail of the resolution of each to create a smooth/averaged display transformation) (col. 10, ll.10-16, 33-38).

As per dependent claim 16, Robertson the blending is performed by admixing said increased and the decreased resolution visual information (i.e. displaying the region of interest in one font and the adjacent region in another font, such that the fonts are mixed to provide the appearance of motion of the lens) (col. 8, ll. 50-61).

As per dependent claim 17, Robertson discloses transmitting the presentation over a network to a remote computer (col. 2, ll. 6-19).

As per dependent claim 19, Robertson discloses the lens surface for rendering the region of interest is defined by the distortion function (i.e. the surface of the border region is transformed/distorted in varying degrees of detail) (col. 8, ll. 17-21).

As per dependent claim 20, Robertson discloses the region of interest, the lens surface, and the lens surface shape include a plurality of regions of interest, a plurality of lens surfaces, and a plurality of lens surface shapes, respectively (i.e. a nested lens within a lensed image) (Fig. 9).

As per dependent claim 21, Robertson fails to specifically disclose the visual information includes newspapers, magazines, telephone directories, and maps. However it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to incorporate selecting visual information from the group consisting of newspapers, magazines, telephone directories, and maps because Robertson discloses the visual information could be a map or a text document (col. 1, ll. 29-30) having multiple pages (col. 7, ll. 64-67). Thus, because a magazines, newspapers and telephone directories are documents having pages of text content the multi-page/line document of Robertson could be any document having content as does magazines, newspapers, maps and phone directories.

As per dependent claim 23, Robertson fails to specifically disclose the display screen is contained in a handheld device. However it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to incorporate the display screen in a handheld device with the disclosure of Robertson because Robertson teaches the display system may be any display in any computer system

As per dependent claim 24, Robertson fails to specifically disclose the visual information is a newspaper page. However it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to incorporate a newspaper page as visual information with the disclosure of Robertson because Robertson discloses the visual information could be a text document (col. 1, ll. 29-30) having multiple pages (col. 7, ll. 64-



Art Unit: 2672

67). Thus, because a newspaper is a document having multiple pages the multi-page document of Robertson could be a newspaper.

As per independent claim 31, Robertson discloses a method as claimed in claim 18. Therefore the rationale applied in the rejection of claim 18 applies herein.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 18, 22 and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Tognazzini et al., U.S. Patent 5,731,805, 3/1998.

As per dependent claim 18, Robertson fails to specifically disclose the visual information includes a portable document format (PDF) document, which Tognazzini discloses (col. 8, ll. 4-10; col. 11, ll. 7-16).

Robertson teaches retrieving and transmitting a text document for display (Fig. 8; col. 2, ll. 6-19).

It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to incorporate Tognazzini's disclosure of visual information includes a portable document format (PDF) document with the disclosure of Robertson because a text document that is transmitted between display systems is formatted such that the document is portable.

As per dependent claim 22, Robertson fails to specifically disclose the visual information includes web page content, which Tognazzini discloses (col.

8, ll. 25-30). Tognazzini teaches magnifying an area of interest of an image, e.g. newspaper, based on user selection. Robertson teaches modifying the resolution, e.g. magnification, of a portion of a viewed image as selected by a user. It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to incorporate Tognazzini's disclosure of visual information including web content with the disclosure of Robertson because Robertson teaches retrieving visual information (Fig. 2) and suggests transmitting the displayable visual information from one system to another (col. 2, ll. 14-20).

As per dependent claim 25, Robertson fails to specifically disclose the newspaper page includes a plurality of headlines, columns, articles, graphics, and advertisements, which Tognazzini discloses (col. 5, ll. 15-20; Figs. 8 & 16). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to incorporate Tognazzini's newspaper page including a plurality of headlines, columns, articles, graphics, and advertisements with the disclosure of Robertson because Robertson teaches selecting visual information that is any of a text document, a map or graph (col. 1, ll. 29-30), where text documents include items such as titles/headlines, columns, advertisements and articles and maps and graphs include graphics. Therefore, a document having content may have any of a plurality of headlines, columns, articles, graphics, and advertisements.

As per dependent claim 26, Robertson fails to specifically disclose the region of interest includes a headline, a column, an article, a graphic, and an

Art Unit: 2672

advertisement, which Tognazzini discloses (col. 5, ll. 15-20; Figs. 8 & 16). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to incorporate Tognazzini's selection from the group consisting of a headline, a column, an article, a graphic, and an advertisement with the disclosure of Robertson because Robertson teaches selecting visual information that is any of a text document, a map or graph (col. 1, ll. 29-30), where text documents include selectable scalable content (Fig. 4), which may include titles/headlines, columns, advertisements and articles; and maps and graphs include graphics. Therefore, a document having content may have any of a plurality of headlines, columns, articles, graphics, and advertisements.

As per dependent claim 27, Robertson in view of Tognazzini discloses said lens surface shape has a shape corresponding to that of the region of interest (Fig. 8; col. 6, ll. 54-56).

As per dependent claim 28, Robertson in view of Tognazzini discloses said lens surface shape has a shape corresponding to a column (Fig. 8).

As per dependent claim 29, Robertson in view of Tognazzini discloses the transformation increases the font size within a portion of the column (i.e. the lens shows the image portion of the document in detail) (Fig. 8).

Art Unit: 2672

As per dependent claim 30, Robertson in view of Tognazzini discloses said lens surface shape is tapered to provide a continuous transition on at least one side of the portion of the column to undistorted text (Fig. 8; col. 8, ll. 17-21).

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 6/21/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant identifies the current invention as including a lens transformation that is entirely general with respect to lens shape.

In reply, Applicant's claim 1 specifically claims "a predetermined lens surface shape". Robertson discloses a lens of a pyramid shape or a multifaceted shape. Thus in view of Robertson the predetermined shape corresponds to the pyramid or multifaceted shape.

Applicant identifies the current invention as distinguishing over the applied prior art, Robertson, because in the current invention the projection direction is uniform with respect to all points displaced by the lens (pp. 8, Para 6) and the lens shape is not altered when the region of interest is moved from a first location to a second location within the visual information (pp. 10, Para 3).

In reply, Applicant does not claim the identified features.

Applicant argues (pp. 9, Para 2), Robertson does not disclose projection onto a plane in a viewer-aligned direction.

In reply, Robertson discloses projection onto a plane (col. 6, ll. 45-51).

Robertson further discloses moving the viewpoint based on the movement of the image lens (col. 4, ll. 25-29). Thus, in moving the viewpoint and the lens relative to one another such that the lens remains within view suggests that the lens is projected in a viewer-aligned direction.

Applicant argues (pp. 10, Para 4) Robertson's discloses reducing the resolution in the side panels of the lens to improve performance, which differs from Applicant's claim of when transitioning a region of interest from a first location to a second location only a border region surrounding the region of interest is transformed.

In reply, Robertson discloses the side panels surround the lens panel and Thus, Robertson teaches the side panels border the lens panel and are a periphery of the region of interest. Robertson further teaches the side panels are greeked while the text within the lens panes are rendered within the font of the text and are not distorted or transformed. Thus, by greeking the side panels while the lens is being moved Robertson discloses transforming the side panels as the region of interest encompassed by the lens is repositioned.

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.**

Art Unit: 2672

See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.



Art Unit: 2672

**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chante Harrison whose telephone number is 703-305-3937. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Razavi can be reached on 703-305-4713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chante Harrison  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2672

November 5, 2004



MICHAEL RAZAVI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600